

00001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CAMP BONNEVILLE
RESTORATION ADVISORY
BOARD MEETING

Court Reporter: Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM

Date: March 19, 2003

Time: 7:00

Place: 8600 N.E. 117th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington

RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

P.O. Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98666

(360) 693-4111

00002

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Hello, everybody. Thank you very
2 much for coming out on this rainy night to our RAB meeting.
3 As most of you already know, I see some new faces,
4 my name is Eric Waehling. I'm the Base Environmental
5 Coordinator, the BEC. Really what I am is the project
6 coordinator, project manager on behalf of the Army for the
7 cleanup of Camp Bonneville.
8 You are joining us for our Restoration Advisory
9 Board, which we hold about once a month, every other month,
10 on an as-needed basis. Usually when we start off these
11 meetings, we go around and offer an opportunity for people,
12 if they want to make their presence known and documented in
13 the administrative record, you're more than welcome to do
14 that. If you're not a RAB member, please don't feel
15 obligated that you have to state your name for the record.
16 It's purely voluntary.
17 I'll start. Again, Eric Waehling, Camp Bonneville
18 BEC.
19 DON WASTLER: Don Wastler, Restoration Advisory
20 Board, neighbor.
21 FRANK FUNK: Frank Funk, RAB member.
22 BUD VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, Northeast Hazel Dell
23 Neighborhood Association and member of RAB.
24 IAN RAY: Ian Ray, RAB.
25 KAREN KINGSTON: Karen Kingston, RAB co-chair.

00003

1 VALERIE LANE: Valerie Lane, RAB.
2 JEROEN KOK: Jeroen Kok, Vancouver Clark Parks and
3 Recreation. Clark County Representative.
4 COLEEN BROAD: Coleen Broad, RAB.
5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Christine Sutherland, RAB and
6 neighbor.
7 JENNIFER WALTERS: Jennifer Walters, Camp Bonneville
8 administrative coordinator.
9 BRONSON POTTER: I'm Bronson Potter, here from the
10 Clark County Prosecuting Attorneys Office.
11 SUE SVENDSEN: Sue Svendsen. I've applied to RAB.
12 JUDIE STANTON: Judie Stanton, Clark County
13 Commissioner.
14 BRUCE OVERBAY: Bruce Overbay, RAB.
15 DON STRICK: Don Strick, Clark County.
16 BILL BARRON: Bill Barron, County administrator.
17 PETE CAPELL: Pete Capell, Public Works.
18 ERIN MIDDLEWOOD: Erin Middlewood, The Columbian.
19 DICK CARROLL: Dick Carroll.
20 CHUCK MASON: Chuck Mason, neighbor.
21 BEN FORSON: Ben Forson, project manager for
22 Ecology.
23 DAWN HOPPER: Dawn Hopper, Ecology. I'll be giving
24 a hand with the public involvement part.
25 ED MARSH: Ed Marsh, FBI.

00004

1 WARREN CARLSON: Warren Carlson, neighbor.

2 GREG JOHNSON: Greg Johnson, Department of Ecology.

3 BRIAN VINCENT: Brian Vincent, Clark County Public
4 Works.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much. As I'm sure
6 you've all noticed, we're trying something different with the
7 seating arrangement. We might need to make a few adjustments
8 as far as making sure we speak up and all, see how it works.
9 Karen, do you want to say anything before we get
10 started?

11 KAREN KINGSTON: No. We can go ahead with the Army
12 updates.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Just take a few quick moments to
14 give you a little bit of update on how we're coming along with
15 some of the work out at Camp Bonneville.
16 As you know, over the last few months, we've been
17 continuing with the Phase II reconnaissance of Camp
18 Bonneville. As you know, we're looking in the western portion
19 of Camp Bonneville to confirm our understanding of, to see if
20 we can learn any more information about the historic usage of
21 what that property was.
22 Parsons Engineering has completed that and now we're
23 in the process of drafting what we've been referring to as the
24 environmental -- excuse me, Engineering Evaluation and Cost
25 Analysis. Other people may refer to it as a Remedial

00005

1 Investigation Feasibility Study. Really what it is is a
2 study, a document that will pull together all the information
3 that we know to date and begin to lay out what are our
4 possible range of options that we have available to us, to the
5 community. When I say "us," I mean the community as well as
6 to the regulators, and to the Army, as to what are some of the
7 possible solutions available to us at Bonneville. That
8 document's currently being written.
9 Right now at the same time that that's going on, we
10 are in the process of conducting soil sampling for the small
11 arms ranges. What we're doing is looking for the lead, to see
12 what the lead levels may be from historical uses of these
13 small arms. When I say "small arms," I'm generally referring
14 to pistols that the Army has used historically. We want to
15 take a look to see what the lead levels are on the ground from
16 those historic uses.
17 As most of you already know, Bonneville has been in
18 use by the Army since 1911. There are a number of historic
19 ranges that we don't necessarily -- that aren't necessarily
20 immediately evident when you walk around. When you look at
21 the maps, we're able to go out to these ranges and we're
22 sampling for lead to see if we have a problem both for human
23 safety as well as ecological impacts. That's an ongoing
24 effort.
25 I haven't received any data yet as to what the lead

00006

1 levels are, but I expect to start seeing that data coming in
2 any day. Of course, I'll share that with you all as I get it.
3 Also we are moving, continuing to move forward, as
4 I've talked about in the past on -- this is Landfill 4. It's
5 actually not on the agenda. I'll let you know that we're
6 still moving forward on contracting to try to have the
7 Landfill 4 removed. As you all know, that's the site that we
8 have groundwater contamination. We believe it's pretty
9 localized. But part of the solutions, one of the things we
10 want to do, is remove Landfill 4, remove the contents. That
11 way we have surety that we don't have anything else being
12 added to the groundwater in the future.
13 Those contracts are ongoing and I'll be meeting with
14 contractors tomorrow to give them a tour of the landfill so
15 they can take a look at it and we'll start getting bids back.
16 I'll let you all know how that all goes as we continue to move
17 forward.
18 As far as ongoing work at Bonneville, that about
19 sums it up at the moment.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: We can open the floor to questions.
21 JEROEN KOK: Regarding the Parsons Engineering site
22 investigation work that was just completed, do you expect that
23 the results of that work will be published in a stand-alone
24 document?
25 ERIC WAEHLING: They'll be incorporated into the

00007

1 RI/FS document and the field report itself will be an
2 appendices that will be incorporated in that. Actually, from
3 what they're telling me, what we're going to do, it's kind of
4 neat, we're going to generate an interactive computer database
5 so that you can graphically represent and turn things on and
6 off to be able to interpret the data as a way of facilitating
7 better access to the information. So that in itself will be a
8 stand-alone - I don't want to call it document - but database.
9 We'll also have a field report associated with that.

10 JEROEN KOK: Okay.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Any questions?

12 I was wondering, I thought we had some soil tests or
13 some tests to date on the lead levels out in that area.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: No. They're taking the samples now.
15 I haven't gotten the lab results back yet.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I thought there was.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: You may be thinking, perhaps, I've
18 gotten some preliminary data over the telephone for the soil
19 data for some of the soil that we sampled when we installed
20 the wells around Demo Site 2 and 3. That I have gotten back.
21 Well, I haven't gotten it back, but I've had reported to me
22 over the telephone that we had non-detects in the groundwater
23 and that we had low levels of residual RDX in the soils. But,
24 again, that was over the telephone. I don't have anything in
25 writing, so I want to caveat those reports until everybody has

00008

1 had a chance to see the quality control and everything.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you want to let everybody know
3 about what the size is of the small arms range, sort of a
4 geographic roundabout.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: There's actually 18 of them.
6 There's multiple small arms ranges. The total acreage that
7 we're sampling is, oh, 300 half-acre grids, so that's about
8 150 acres total, about. That's off the top of my head.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: Approximately?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, it's approximately.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you have the quarterly
13 water samples put together yet?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: The quarterly water? Yes. Thank
15 you very much for bringing that up.

16 In the back of the room, we have this next draft
17 report for the investigation of Landfill 4, Demo Site 1. That
18 has been the site we've talked about so much. I've printed up
19 15 copies of this document. As you see, it's a big, thick
20 document for the RAB members. I'm happy to make additional
21 copies of this document. It is also in all three public
22 repositories. For anybody that wants a copy, because of the
23 expense associated with making copies, I wanted to make sure I
24 only printed up what was actually needed by people that were
25 interested in reading this.

00009

1 To answer your question, all the quarterly data is
2 in this report as well as the maps and the locations and the
3 geotechnical information that they learned from the wells.
4 This is a draft. I just got review comments back from the
5 Department of Ecology. If anybody has any comments they want
6 to make any on it, feel free just to send them to me.
7 There's a volume two. This is volume one of two
8 volumes. There's a volume two which is also in the public
9 repositories. It's all the technical nitty-gritty backup data
10 that comes from the lab inventories and field notes and things
11 like that. I didn't make copies of those. If anybody wants a
12 copy of that, I'll be happy to print it up. It's available in
13 the public repository if you want to take a look at it. The
14 meat and potatoes, what's most interesting, is in this volume
15 here.
16 For RAB members, there's 15 copies in the back. If
17 we run short and people want their own hard copy, please talk
18 to Jennifer Walters, and she'll get your name, number, we'll
19 print additional copies.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: I had another question, too.
21 Correct me, because I was under the assumption
22 somewhere in the last couple of years that small arms were
23 shot pretty much, you know, over -- well, I would say over
24 more than just 150 acres. What are you doing about that?
25 ERIC WAEHLING: What we did was the range safety fan

00010

1 covered a lot more than 150 acres. But what we were able to
2 do, we have modern ranges where we currently have a berm and a
3 firing point. Actually we decided that it didn't make a whole
4 lot of sense to go sample those berms when. You go and pick
5 up a handful of bullets, there's obviously lead there, we need
6 to take action.
7 In the Agreed Order, you'll see one of the required
8 elements is for the Army to take interim action on those
9 berms. We're in the process of contracting that right now.
10 That will most likely be some sort of removal. There will be
11 work plans. You'll see those work plans.
12 Then we have the historic ranges which are the
13 ranges that might be, say, from 1915. When you walk on the
14 ground, you can't see any direct evidence of where they were.
15 So what we did was we looked at the old manuals and
16 back-engineered how they would have constructed these,
17 calculated where the targets would have been. You can
18 calculate where the bullets are most likely to fall, the
19 concentration of the bullets. That's how we decided to focus
20 where we sample.
21 So we lay a grid on top of that. For every half
22 acre, we take five samples, individual, discrete samples.
23 That will tell us -- we composite that to see if we're going
24 to see elevated lead levels over these areas. That will tell
25 us, A, whether we have a problem; and, B, we begin to say, "Do

00011

1 we need to sample more intensively in these areas because we
2 appear to have elevated lead levels?"

3 KAREN KINGSTON: These are within that 150 acres
4 you're dealing with?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

6 BUD VAN CLEVE: What is the size of those samplings
7 that you're taking?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a soil sample.

9 BUD VAN CLEVE: How much?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Each sample? Gee, I forget the
11 exact volume off the top of my head. They just take a soil
12 sample jar. They have to scrape off the surface. It's zero
13 to six inches from the surface of the ground. They dig it up
14 and put it in a sample jar, send it off to the lab. They
15 sieve it, because they want the particulates, then they send
16 it off to the lab to see what the lead levels are. It's over
17 a thousand individual samples.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: Is that the Reuse Plan for
19 overnight camping and day camping, is that within that 150
20 acres or does that fall outside that scope?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: No, I believe where the camping is
22 intended right now falls on top of one of the ranges. That's
23 one of the ones we're sampling.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Where the overnight camping is?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

00012

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Sean.

2 SEAN SHELDRAKE: I had a question for Eric about the
3 berm movement. Is that planned as time critical or non-time
4 critical?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Planned as an interim removal action
6 under MOTCA.

7 SEAN SHELDRAKE: You're going to be doing public
8 comment for that?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. The same thing for Landfill 4.
10 It will have to go through a public comment period both by
11 CERCLA and Washington State law. There will be a 30-day
12 public comment period, as well as RAB participation.

13 SEAN SHELDRAKE: You have a tentative time frame?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: We're starting the contracting
15 action now. The Army's objective is to try to do it within
16 this field season.

17 SEAN SHELDRAKE: I meant in terms of the public
18 comment period.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: When that will fall? I don't know
20 off the top of my head.

21 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Okay, thanks.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Any more questions?

23 We'll move on then to the community updates. One of
24 the things that Eric and I have been talking about is we've
25 got four seats available on the RAB. We are going to form a

00013

1 subcommittee. I need volunteers to be on this subcommittee.
2 I'm hoping somebody will raise their hand here. It will be a
3 membership selection panel.
4 One of the main things we need to do, make sure we
5 are following here, and it's in the Department of Defense
6 guidelines and specifically the Army guidelines, as well, to
7 make sure we've got a real complement of diversity throughout
8 the community, that we're covering every sector, and we're not
9 focusing on any special interests, we're focusing through the
10 whole community.
11 We decided that he's busy (referring to Eric
12 Waehling), I'm busy, so we thought a subcommittee would be a
13 good idea because the commander is basically the committee to
14 approve.
15 ERIC WAEHLING: Also we had mentioned with this same
16 committee, it would be the one to scrub the bylaws to make
17 sure they're compliant --
18 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: -- consistent with the most recent
20 TAPP guides.
21 KAREN KINGSTON: We need to bring up the bylaws to
22 the most recent TAPP guidance and whatnot. That committee
23 will also be involved. I'm more than happy to help and be
24 involved. I just can't chair it or something like that.
25 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank.

00014

1 FRANK FUNK: I believe you're referring to 5.2 of
2 these '98 guidelines. The bylaws, under item 2A, last
3 sentence, Fort Lewis approves or disapproves the applications.
4 KAREN KINGSTON: No, I'm correcting you, Frank, it's
5 5.3. It's also mentioned in 6.2.
6 FRANK FUNK: Under that?
7 KAREN KINGSTON: It's also mentioned in 6.2 and page
8 23.
9 FRANK FUNK: Well, it starts out at selection of
10 members, 5.2 on page seven.
11 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes. I'm aware of that.
12 ERIC WAEHLING: Anyway, what's your thought, Frank?
13 FRANK FUNK: You've got the bylaws. You were
14 talking about scrubbing the bylaws.
15 KAREN KINGSTON: We're not scrubbing them.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: We're going to review them for
17 consistency.
18 KAREN KINGSTON: Review them for consistency.
19 FRANK FUNK: There might be a conflict between the
20 two a little bit.
21 KAREN KINGSTON: There is a conflict. The bylaws
22 were based on the previous guidance. In 1998 the Department
23 of Defense did a branch-specific advisory and participation
24 guide. What we're doing is we're -- just because we've been
25 running under these old laws, we're going to bring it up to

00015

1 current guidance so that we're running on an even keel here
2 and up to date.
3 FRANK FUNK: Your current complement of RAB people
4 are about 50% neighbors. If you're going to comply with the
5 guidance thing, you're going to have to get business people
6 and everything else, which it says in there.
7 KAREN KINGSTON: Would you like to be on the
8 committee?
9 FRANK FUNK: Not really, but I will.
10 KAREN KINGSTON: Can I have anybody raise their
11 hands so we can put their name and we'll put them on the
12 committee?
13 ERIC WAEHLING: Volunteers.
14 KAREN KINGSTON: We have Coleen Broad, Christine
15 Sutherland, Don Wastler.
16 DON WASTLER: I might contribute something besides
17 attendance. Come on, Ian.
18 IAN RAY: How many do you have?
19 KAREN KINGSTON: Frank, are you going to be on it?
20 FRANK FUNK: I said I would. Didn't really want to
21 be, but I would.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you want to?
23 IAN RAY: Yeah, okay.
24 KAREN KINGSTON: You're good with words, our
25 wordsmith. Good deal.

00016

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much, you brave
2 souls.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: We're going to have a presentation.
4 We did this seating thing tonight because we've gotten quite a
5 few calls from the community, maybe thought there would be
6 more community here than there is.

7 Anyway, we're going to have a presentation from Greg
8 Johnson. He's the UXO expert for the Washington State
9 Department of Ecology. He's going to be clarifying quite a
10 few things when it comes to munitions, whether they're buried
11 or UXO. If you're part of the community, please just raise
12 your hand to me if we're using acronyms a little too much. We
13 get kind of locked into that a bit.

14 What we'd like to do is let the presenters do their
15 presentation, and get yourself a pad and paper out, make your
16 notes, then after the presentation, rather than interrupting
17 the presenters at this point, afterwards we'll just open the
18 floor and everyone can ask all their questions after the
19 presentation is completed.

20 FRANK FUNK: You mean, you can't ask questions in
21 between time?

22 KAREN KINGSTON: No.

23 FRANK FUNK: I disagree with that. The main reason
24 is, the first subject is the bomb. To my knowledge --

25 KAREN KINGSTON: As soon as Greg is finished, you'll

00017

1 have a chance to ask him. Just make notes.
2 FRANK FUNK: The point is, if there were no bombs
3 dropped here --
4 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm not the UXO expert, Frank.
5 You'll have to wait for the presentation.
6 FRANK FUNK: I don't think I have to wait. I have a
7 question and I think it should be answered. Why spend time on
8 a bomb that wasn't used here?
9 KAREN KINGSTON: Will you wait for the presentation,
10 please? Ian.
11 IAN RAY: The first line says, "What is a bomb?" It
12 seems like that's going to be explained.
13 KAREN KINGSTON: He's going to explain the
14 differences. A lot of people seem to think that something big
15 is much more dangerous when actually something small has a
16 fragile fuse and might be more dangerous than something big.
17 We're going to have clarification on that. Afterwards, we've
18 got Clark County representatives here that have given their
19 time. They're going to answer questions and go from there.
20 Let's go ahead and start with Greg Johnson. Greg,
21 do you want to come on up here.
22 GREG JOHNSON: This kind of threw me for a loop
23 because of the way the tables were. I brought some training
24 aids. I put them back here.
25 Did everybody get a copy of this? I made 25 copies.

00018

1 I don't think there's enough.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Are they on the table?

3 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah, they're on the table. I kind
4 of put this together for today to kind of let everybody know
5 where we stand right now as far as UXO goes at the camp
6 because there has been some discussion at previous meetings
7 about amounts of ordnance, where the ordnance is, whether or
8 not it's safe. What I'm going to try to do is try and
9 clarify.

10 It's not harmless out there, but then on the other
11 hand it's not like Afghanistan. We do have a problem, but the
12 problem can be dealt with.

13 As far as the bomb question goes, there were never
14 bombs dropped at Camp Bonneville, but there were a lot of
15 bombs disposed of at Camp Bonneville. We have physical
16 evidence of conical nose plugs that were disposed of at Demo
17 Area 1. They were probably bombs that were code hotel, which
18 means the explosives in them were too old to be used, so they
19 brought them here for disposal.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Just to add a little bit of
21 anecdotal evidence, before you joined us, Greg, we had found a
22 concrete-filled 500-pound casing, as well, that the Air Force
23 Reserve no doubt left for us.

24 GREG JOHNSON: To the extent of what is a bomb,
25 that's about as far as I'll go.

00019

1 On here I put question number one: What ordnance is
2 out there, where is it? Two: How dangerous is the ordnance
3 at Camp Bonneville? Three: Are we worried about training
4 ordnance?
5 There seems to be a misunderstanding on training
6 ordnance, what training ordnance is. Thus far, we have a lot
7 of very strong evidence that a great deal of ordnance was used
8 at Camp Bonneville between 1909 and 1995. The type of
9 evidence we have is archival evidence, physical evidence and
10 TEC photo analysis.
11 For archival evidence, first thing we have to do
12 with archival evidence is we have to see whether it's good or
13 not. I break it down into firsthand and secondhand
14 information. Firsthand information would be like Jerry
15 Cummings was a safety officer and groundskeeper out there for
16 a long time. Basically what he says was there, I would firmly
17 believe was there. Then soldiers were interviewed that were
18 out there, stuff like that.
19 Then we go into secondhand information, and that
20 would be like someone who lives three blocks away says their
21 mother's brother's sister's uncle, their mule stepped on
22 something and blew it up in 1940 or 1950 up on Little Elk Horn
23 Mountain or something like that. Although that may be true,
24 we can't put a lot of stock in it for putting together the
25 picture of what we have here.

00020

1 The next is physical evidence. Physical evidence is
2 undisputable. In a certain area, if we dig something up
3 that's there, like for instance the 37 millimeters, 76
4 millimeters, we have anti-tank rounds. If we just find the
5 frag or whatever, they're there. It's there, it's been fired
6 there, it wasn't placed there. That's undisputable evidence
7 there.
8 Next is photographic analysis. That's also
9 indisputable. Basically every two years planes did a
10 fly-over, and they took pictures. We can take those pictures
11 and we can find scars on the ground and we can put together
12 things out of that. Granted, that was only every two years,
13 it was only for that one day. But we can still gather a lot
14 from that, a lot more than we can than from just about
15 everything else.
16 Then we come down to the data that we have to date.
17 First, we'll break that down into the surface reconnaissance
18 Phase I data. We identified firing points, magazines,
19 training areas, training features, vegetation and some surface
20 UXO. This was primarily used to build a conceptual site model
21 of ordnance-related activities at Camp Bonneville. To date,
22 the data from Phase II isn't available at this time, so we're
23 just basing this on Phase I.
24 The second is the UXB site stats grid stats,
25 subsurface random sampling of 203 100-by-100 grids. This

00021

1 totals approximately 100 acres out of 3900.
2 As far as the future reuse area goes, approximately
3 25 acres of that was sampled. We don't put a lot of stock in
4 this because to date site stats grid stats are looked at as
5 fundamentally flawed by a lot of people. They did dig up
6 those areas, most of those areas, because a lot of them were
7 done with an X pattern or diagonally. As far as statistics
8 go, they don't rely on them, on site stats grid stats, like
9 they did five years ago. So it is data, but it's not that
10 great of data to have.
11 This being said, we can now put the evidence
12 together for Camp Bonneville, starting with the archival. The
13 strongest firsthand accounts would be the Jerry Cummings
14 interview and the Greg Parsons interview. Jerry, like I said,
15 was the caretaker and range officer at Camp Bonneville for a
16 considerable length of time. He makes several statements that
17 are of interest. On page three is his interview. I've
18 underlined some of the stuff. One of them was that there were
19 tank targets in the future reuse area. If you'll turn to page
20 three, you can see there's a hand-drawn map on there of where
21 they are.
22 A detailed map for the ASR -- that was page four,
23 sorry.
24 He also stated the majority of UXO found to that
25 date has been found outside the central impact area.

00022

1 Next we had the interview with Greg Parsons. Greg
2 Parsons is an EoD tech stationed at Vancouver Barracks. He's
3 now the Army Corps of Engineers UXO safety person. His
4 statement was that he remembers ordnance being used just about
5 everywhere at the camp.
6 Next we come to the physical evidence. Of the
7 physical evidence, approximately 70, 80% of the ordnance has
8 been found in and near the future reuse area. Some examples
9 are the 2.36 rockets here (indicating).
10 ERIC WAEHLING: Would you hold that up again so
11 everybody can see it.
12 GREG JOHNSON: On break, you guys can come back here
13 and look at this. This is all inert ordnance. It's not going
14 to hurt anybody. It's a shoulder-fired rocket. Within the
15 last three months, we found two of these, and a smoke grenade.
16 37 millimeter projectiles, this is a lot of what
17 we're worried about (indicating). There's several versions of
18 these. The ones we found were high explosive.
19 40 millimeter projectiles. These are the ones we're
20 really worried about (indicating). These are real bad.
21 Lastly, we have the TEC aerial photographs. Those
22 are on pages seven and eight. They show numerous tank tracks,
23 possible targets and impact craters in the future reuse area.
24 What this all means when it's all said and done, we
25 put this together, we have evidence that there were targets in

00023

1 the future reuse area where we're going to be putting the
2 park. The 37 millimeters were an anti-tank round, okay? That
3 backs up what Greg Parsons and Jerry Cummings had said about
4 the tank targets being out there. Then we have the TEC photo
5 analysis that shows tank tracks in that area. Putting it all
6 together, we'll come to the conclusion that we possibly have
7 target areas out there that need to be addressed.
8 For this to happen, we can't just say we think
9 something's out there, we have to go out and find it, which
10 means we're going to have to do some subsurface work here.
11 The surface work, just surface clearance, reconnaissance is
12 not going to be enough to prove that we don't have ordnance
13 out there that's buried and could function, could possibly
14 function.
15 The second question we had was, "How dangerous is
16 the ordnance at Camp Bonneville?"
17 The majority of the ordnance used at Camp Bonneville
18 has been fired and is considered to be armed and extremely
19 unstable and could detonate with the slightest disturbance.
20 That's a majority of the stuff we have right over here
21 (indicating).
22 Some remaining ordnance is training ordnance that is
23 relatively harmless. However, only qualified military or
24 civilian professionals can make that determination. We cannot
25 have people finding this stuff saying, "Look what I found."

00024

1 It won't work.
2 Then the last question was, "The difference in
3 training or practice ordnance?"
4 In some cases it's very extreme, and in others it's
5 very light. Like the 37 millimeter here, this one here is
6 solid (indicating). This was used for armor piercing. Then
7 you have two other versions. One is HE, high explosive, and
8 the other one is called TP, target practice. The difference
9 in the two, they're the same shell, but one has TNT in it, the
10 other one has black powder. They both have the same fuse. So
11 by saying that it's practice ordnance, they used it for target
12 practice, but it could kill you just as easily as an HE round.
13 It's basically the same thing, with the exception of black
14 powder, TNT.
15 The 40 millimeter here, we have -- there's four to
16 five different versions. The ones at Camp Bonneville would be
17 the high explosive one, which is just like this, except it's
18 got a gold color to it. That's a high explosive. This has an
19 all-way action fuse in it, which means any direction it hits,
20 it will detonate. Any movement at all of this could detonate
21 it.
22 This version of it actually has the same fuse, but
23 it's a practice version, one gram of explosives in it, which
24 would be enough to take your hand off but probably not enough
25 to kill you.

00025

1 Then the third version, there's a lot of these blue
2 ones. What they do, you'll shoot these, they'll break open
3 and an orange dye will cover the ground so that you know where
4 you were shooting at. This has no explosives in it or
5 anything like that, but they're starting to find out that the
6 dye is toxic, the dye that's in it. Basically we don't want
7 anybody handling any type of this ordnance.
8 As far as the impact area goes, this is where you're
9 going to find your mortars like this, your projectiles like
10 this (indicating). The rest of the camp, where we found that
11 2.36 about two months ago should have never been there.
12 There's no reason. There was no target area up there or
13 anything. It was laying on the surface, armed, ready to
14 function.
15 Another big worry is going to be grenades. About
16 two weeks ago they found a smoke grenade. It's a smoke
17 grenade now, but there may be some of these laying around out
18 there. We all know what can happen with those.
19 These are the claymore mines. The ones used out
20 here were all training, so there's no big deal with those.
21 Still, it's not something someone should be playing with.
22 That about sums it up, unless anyone has any
23 questions?
24 KAREN KINGSTON: The 2.36 that you just mentioned,
25 did you determine if that was a kick-out since there was no

00026

1 reason for it to be there or you're going to look back?
2 GREG JOHNSON: The 2.36 was fired, it was fired and
3 armed.
4 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.
5 FRANK FUNK: Greg, you mentioned about a mule
6 stepping on something. I don't want to leave a misimpression
7 on people here, but I think there's no record of any animal or
8 human being being blown up or injured here on the property
9 that I'm aware of.
10 GREG JOHNSON: No, no. Me either.
11 FRANK FUNK: So your reference was just a comment;
12 it was not a fact that it happened?
13 GREG JOHNSON: It was a comment. I was
14 distinguishing between firsthand and secondhand information.
15 FRANK FUNK: The other thing I have, smoke grenades,
16 they're not explosive; as I understand, they just make a
17 smoke.
18 GREG JOHNSON: They're pyrotechnic.
19 FRANK FUNK: Will they explode?
20 GREG JOHNSON: No. But they'll burn at 2400
21 degrees.
22 IAN RAY: In the last paragraph on your page one,
23 although that information is called "fundamentally flawed," in
24 the last RAB meeting it was stated that the USACE - what is
25 that, the Army Corps of Engineers? - would use that data to

00027

1 calculate the cost.
2 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.
3 IAN RAY: How did they do that if the information is
4 fundamentally flawed?
5 GREG JOHNSON: The statistical method of doing it is
6 what is fundamentally flawed. If you look in their EE/CA, a
7 lot of the cost estimates they believe are good. Like Eric
8 had said, they may say \$15,000 per acre to do the type of
9 clearance we want, but it may actually cost \$12,000 an acre.
10 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. And, Greg, if I could ask
11 you to clarify. When you say that the data is fundamentally
12 flawed, do you actually mean what you actually found, what we
13 actually found when we dug things up in the grids, or do you
14 mean how we interpreted that data, the statistics that they
15 used?
16 GREG JOHNSON: The statistics.
17 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. So if you found something
18 there --
19 GREG JOHNSON: What you found is what you found.
20 The statistics are fundamentally flawed. That's good, usable
21 data.
22 ERIC WAEHLING: That's the element that's usable.
23 The conclusions they drew from what they found are flawed.
24 GREG JOHNSON: As far as using data to interpret a
25 conceptual model is fundamentally flawed. What they'll do is

00028

1 randomly spit out grids over an area. The way this works is
2 over here you could have a big target area, and you may have
3 one grid in it, and over here you may have nothing, you may
4 have 10 grids in it (indicating).

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

6 GREG JOHNSON: That's what I mean by "fundamentally
7 flawed."

8 ERIC WAEHLING: The design of where you located your
9 sample points. The information that we know about each one of
10 those 100-by-100 foot grids, that can be valuable, but you
11 certainly cannot rely upon it exclusively.

12 GREG JOHNSON: It could be useful.

13 IAN RAY: As a follow-up to that, can you explain
14 the second sentence? "Approximately 25 acres out of 1300
15 acres within the future reuse area were sampled." When was
16 that done?

17 GREG JOHNSON: Site stat grid stat. On the very
18 back page here, you'll see this map. I should have brought my
19 big board in. You'll see these push pins I have in here.
20 Those are significant ordnance finds throughout the camp. The
21 black outlined area here is the future park, the reuse area.
22 If you count the grids that are in here, there's approximately
23 25 of them. I'm sorry, there's 50 of them. 100-by-100 is a
24 half acre. I approximated that at 25 acres.

25 IAN RAY: One final note. 203 100-by-100 grids is

00029

1 not a hundred acres, it's 46.6 acres.

2 GREG JOHNSON: Okay.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, I'd like to add something
4 to that. You're absolutely correct as far as the acreage for
5 the subsurface investigation. But the reconnaissance work is
6 a level of sampling. Now, the data is different and you have
7 to appreciate it for what it can tell you and what it can't
8 tell you. But we actually know more than just what those
9 discrete points tell us. We've done more sampling than just
10 that.

11 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah. It's surface sampling that
12 basically tells us where firing points were, magazines, things
13 like that.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: There's limitations to it.

15 GREG JOHNSON: It tells us nothing about subsurface.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Correct, right.

17 DON WASTLER: The dots you have on the map, is that
18 ordnance you found yourself since you've been here?

19 GREG JOHNSON: No. This is ordnance from Jerry
20 Cummings when he was there all the way through where the Army
21 is now.

22 DON WASTLER: This is what they've found through all
23 the years so far?

24 GREG JOHNSON: Oh, no. This is roughly since
25 probably 1990 maybe.

00030

1 DON WASTLER: I see. Within the last 10 years?
2 GREG JOHNSON: That's actually not accurate. If you
3 consider the time-critical removal, which was in the future
4 reuse area, there's probably a thousand.
5 DON WASTLER: Have they ever found any outside in
6 the buffer zone? There's a buffer zone that goes around
7 there.
8 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to address that last one.
9 Those little blue eggs, do they qualify as ordnance?
10 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: Do they qualify as UXO?
12 GREG JOHNSON: No, not UXO. But these do
13 (indicating).
14 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm talking about the blue eggs.
15 GREG JOHNSON: Not all blue eggs were found there.
16 These were also found (indicating).
17 ERIC WAEHLING: The pyrotechnic versions were found?
18 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: I'll have to double-check.
20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The impact area as it stands
21 right now is completely off limits. It's going to be fenced.
22 The Reuse Plan, the park is not going to be on top of the
23 impact area or any type of activity on it so far?
24 ERIC WAEHLING: No trails.
25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: No trails. If our impact

00031

1 area is deemed extremely off limits, then with your
2 presentation and all the information that I've read so far, I
3 don't understand why the entire site is not an impact area.
4 The second paragraph down on page two, I read that and I don't
5 understand.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Sean, do you want to say something
7 to that?

8 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Sean Shel Drake, EPA.

9 Whether that area is going to be fenced and left
10 versus something else is still open to public comment. That
11 still has to be presented by the Army with other options, as
12 well.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: But we're working right now
14 on the reuse site. The site -- the back of the map shows all
15 of the pins stuck on there. You know, if you look at the
16 definition of an impact area, it sounds like from the second
17 paragraph down on page two, we're talking about an impact area
18 on 3800 acres of Camp Bonneville.

19 GREG JOHNSON: There may be other impact areas we
20 don't know about.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Then why is it treated so
22 different than the impact area that everyone won't drive in or
23 touch?

24 GREG JOHNSON: That is bounded. That's bounded. We
25 know where that is.

00032

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: It's been moved, though,
2 across the years.

3 GREG JOHNSON: And the fence right now is at the
4 widest point.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The widest point?

6 GREG JOHNSON: Yes. We know for a fact that isn't a
7 factor.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Tonight we know as part of
9 your presentation for a fact that we have impact area on a lot
10 of ground.

11 GREG JOHNSON: We may. Until we do, subsurface
12 geophysics --

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to say something on behalf
14 of the Army. Precisely that question that you have asked,
15 which is why the Army's position is that you're going -- one
16 of the questions that we'll come to is the difference between
17 the previous EE/CA and what we're going to be writing now.
18 We're doing things differently now where, as Greg mentioned,
19 historically the EE/CA was based on what is now viewed as a
20 fundamentally flawed decision-making process, about how you
21 decide where you sample, how you draw conclusions about where
22 you need to do work.

23 I can say one of the basic positions that we have
24 now is that where there are going to be people, we're going to
25 do clearance. Whether we believe people will be there or not,

00033

1 we're going to do subsurface investigation and clearance at a
2 minimum.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is your clearance going to be
4 100% safe?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Nothing is 100% safe. It will be
6 the very best that is available that can be done.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand. I understand
8 that that's the technology available today. But as I sit here
9 and read this, I live down the street, my kids are going to
10 ride their bikes there. I know you guys have heard this. I
11 don't understand. I don't understand. How about if I just
12 leave it at that.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: It will be safe.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If it's not 100% safe, how is
15 it safe?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Do you mean 100% risk-free?

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Safe. If a Boy Scout pounds
18 a stake in an area that we haven't checked, we talked about
19 checking areas 30 feet across from each other, if he blows up
20 a rocket or something that is buried 12 inches under the
21 ground, he won't be safe.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. Which is precisely why in
23 the tent camping area as a perfect example, is why we need to
24 go in and do 100% geophysical.

25 A subsurface clearance, would you mind walking us

00034

1 through what that process is?

2 GREG JOHNSON: First thing you do is a surface
3 clearance to remove as many of the contacts as possible, like
4 the pop cans, soup cans, frag, all that stuff. You get all
5 that removed, then you go in with the geophysics and you
6 search subsurface.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Maybe for the people that
8 haven't been here before, four meetings ago at Camp
9 Bonneville, they put together a grid. They're 30 feet apart
10 checking for the pop cans.

11 GREG JOHNSON: That's reconnaissance.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: So remediation is going to be
13 this close (indicating)?

14 GREG JOHNSON: They're going to do 100% of the area
15 that they're searching for subsurface. First they do the
16 surface clearance, remove all the metal they can, then they're
17 going to go in with the EM-61 and they're going to go through
18 there and make a map of all the anomalies that are left there.
19 They're going to reacquire those anomalies with GPS, dig them
20 and remove the anomalies.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are we going to totally
22 remove the vegetation and the trees?

23 GREG JOHNSON: Oh, no.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How is this 100% then?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: In the areas such as the tent

00035

1 camping, the answer is yes.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Remove every piece down to
3 the dirt to be able to detect any hazards under the ground?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Again, Greg, you've actually done
5 this work. But my understanding, when you do 100% clearance
6 on an area such as a tent camping area, that's exactly how you
7 do it, is that true?

8 BEN FORSON: Ben Forson, project manager for
9 Ecology.

10 I think what she wants to know is we know the
11 spacing was about 30 feet into it, but what is going to be the
12 spacing during cleanup clearance. That's I think what she
13 wants to know.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand it's not going
15 to be zero clearance.

16 BEN FORSON: Is it going to be shoulder-to-shoulder?

17 GREG JOHNSON: On a surface clearance, it will be
18 shoulder-to-shoulder, for the surface part of it.

19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How is that possible with the
20 vegetation?

21 GREG JOHNSON: It will have to be removed. Not all
22 of it but a certain percentage of it. We're not going to cut
23 every tree and dig up every stone, that's not feasibly
24 possible. It's possible, but it's out of --

25 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Sean Shel Drake, EPA.

00036

1 I was going to mention an alternative to the
2 geophysical clearance would be to dig and sieve for RV and
3 tent camping areas where you want an extra level of certainty
4 that there's nothing you're going to hit when you're hammering
5 in a metal stake. Geophysical clearance has some level of
6 interpretation to it. Greg is more of an expert on that than
7 I am, but dig and sieve, you actually dig it up, sieve the
8 soil, know exactly what's in that soil column to a certain
9 depth, however deep you're digging.
10 GREG JOHNSON: The reason I can't answer a lot of
11 these questions right now is because we don't have the plan
12 together yet to either approve it or disapprove it.
13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is early transfer going to
14 take place before you have those answers?
15 GREG JOHNSON: That wouldn't be a question I can
16 answer.
17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Sean, will you stand up and
18 say that it will take place?
19 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Yes.
20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just want that on the
21 record. That's very important.
22 COLEEN BROAD: Data from Phase II on the recon is
23 not available at this time. When will it be available?
24 GREG JOHNSON: That would be Eric.
25 ERIC WAEHLING: The data is going to be incorporated

00037

1 into the feasibility study.

2 COLEEN BROAD: So we've acquired the data and we're
3 just forming the statistics?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. We've completed the
5 fieldwork so the data has been collected. Now it's being
6 assimilated and formatted to a usable form which will then be
7 incorporated with a whole bunch of other stuff.

8 COLEEN BROAD: Do we know when that Phase II will be
9 complete?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: As far as when you'll have it, I'm
11 expecting it within the next couple months that we'll actually
12 have the data available to provide you. Standing on its own,
13 it doesn't really mean a whole lot. It's when you begin to
14 knit it together with everything else you begin to define your
15 ranges of options.

16 One of the options we will evaluate, cost out, is
17 digging and sieving the entire installation to a depth of X
18 number of feet. Then the opposite range of options will be
19 evaluated which is to do nothing. What is the risk and the
20 cost of doing nothing? Then there's a number of options in
21 between those two that will also be considered. That's all
22 part of the public process. Everybody will have a shot. The
23 RAB will have a shot at it before everybody else. Everybody
24 else will have a chance.

25 COLEEN BROAD: Will the site model of

00038

1 ordnance-related activities change when we get the
2 information?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Maybe you can help me with site
4 model.

5 COLEEN BROAD: It says this was --

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Conceptual site model, no.

7 COLEEN BROAD: That will not change, even though
8 we're going to be getting additional data?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: The conceptual site model, and I
10 don't want to get us off the agenda, and, Greg, jump in here,
11 the conceptual site model, what it is is it explains how
12 people might become exposed to UXO, how an accident might
13 happen. It doesn't define what Camp Bonneville is today or
14 what it will be tomorrow, it just helps clarify conceptually,
15 okay, if we have a piece of UXO or chemical, you could have
16 gasoline, if we have gasoline in the ground, how would
17 somebody potentially come in contact with that gasoline and
18 come to harm? That's the model. It doesn't define where
19 things are or what it looks like.

20 GREG JOHNSON: To answer your question, yes, that's
21 what the data will be used for.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

23 GREG JOHNSON: For the conceptual site model.

24 COLEEN BROAD: Thank you.

25 LOREN CARLSON: Loren Carlson, neighbor.

00039

1 You were talking about the bombs out there, the
2 disposed bombs. Are they live? Is there a possibility of
3 them --
4 GREG JOHNSON: They are not armed. They were bombs
5 that were brought out there and disposed of.
6 LOREN CARLSON: No physical danger?
7 GREG JOHNSON: No.
8 LOREN CARLSON: Possible environmental danger?
9 ERIC WAEHLING: Can you clarify what you mean by
10 "disposed"?
11 GREG JOHNSON: Blown in place.
12 LOREN CARLSON: Out there? No possibility of any
13 live bombs out there?
14 GREG JOHNSON: There's always a possibility.
15 LOREN CARLSON: Then you were talking about the
16 photographic analysis every two years. Since when?
17 GREG JOHNSON: Since 1940. I put in there also
18 there's a big data gap between 1909 and 1940. That was our
19 first photos. '44 were good photos. '48 were good photos.
20 But between 1940 and 1999, we have a huge data gap. That's
21 why we don't know what's out there.
22 LOREN CARLSON: My last one real quick. You were
23 talking about some of these. You said some are real bad.
24 Does that mean physical danger or environmental danger or
25 both?

00040

1 GREG JOHNSON: I'm not an environmental expert, but
2 I would say more on the physical, yes. As far as the chemical
3 constituents, you can talk to Ben, he can field that answer,
4 maybe Sean.
5 LOREN CARLSON: Thank you.
6 KAREN KINGSTON: Christine.
7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: With the photos, did you say
8 '41, photos from '41 up?
9 GREG JOHNSON: Yes, roughly.
10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand World War I
11 ordnance has hardly any directional type of help, it just is
12 kind of trial and error mostly in the World War I era
13 ordnance. Kind of what I get an impression of.
14 GREG JOHNSON: That's inaccurate. This here is from
15 1906 (indicating). It's spin stabilized. It has a
16 powder-trained time fuse. It was very accurate.
17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.
18 GREG JOHNSON: That mortar right there came out in
19 about probably 1918. It's still used today. 60s and 81s.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: I have two questions, too.
21 Greg, you've come across research the same way I
22 have. Would you just be able to back me up and say you've
23 seen the reports that six children have died on closed
24 transferred bases, finding 36 mm?
25 GREG JOHNSON: 37 millimeter. None have died of 36.

00041

1 37, I wouldn't go with the closed transferring or transferred.
2 The Tierra Santa incident wasn't a closed transferring or
3 transferred. It was some homes that were built on an impact
4 area, impact area.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Old impact area.

6 GREG JOHNSON: Port Angeles training area, two kids
7 that died here, that wasn't a closed transferred or
8 transferring. It was just when the military moved out.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: Mississippi, four kids hurt, two
10 died, that was a closed transferred.

11 GREG JOHNSON: 37 millimeters have probably killed
12 more than any other ordnance. That's what my biggest -- one
13 of my biggest concerns about Camp Bonneville is the 37
14 millimeter rounds. A kid digs one of these up, it looks fun,
15 it looks neat.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Especially the other ones. From
17 what we've got documentation of, kids that have found them,
18 they call them Easter eggs. Most kids think those are real
19 interesting. They call them Easter eggs.

20 GREG JOHNSON: When it's fired and laying on the
21 ground, it looks just like this (indicating). The gold
22 anodized ones are the ones that will get you. They look just
23 like that. They look like they're fun to play with.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Quickly, is there a way to
25 detect the 37 millimeters during remediation? I'm not talking

00042

1 just on the high reuse tent area, I'm talking on the area that
2 we're going to have trails through.

3 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.

4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: There's a way?

5 GREG JOHNSON: The detection technology is going to
6 be whatever we choose to use, whether it's geophysics or
7 whether it's surface clearance or whatever. Yes, they're
8 detectable. They're a ferrous metal. Their size is
9 detectable, yeah. You can pick up .50 cal rounds with the
10 Schonstadt.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: High powered 61 was able to see it
12 in geophysical prove-out. We had mock-ups.

13 GREG JOHNSON: They're actually things just like
14 this that are in the prove-out grid. I have copies of that if
15 anybody ever wants to see it. It will show a 60 millimeter,
16 show a 37.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't want to speak on behalf of
18 Ecology, but the Army's position is wherever there are going
19 to be people on Bonneville, we're going to need to do a
20 subsurface clearance. Where there's going to be tent camping,
21 we have to do subsurface. Where there's going to be an
22 education center, we got to do it. Along the trails, we got
23 to do it.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Any more questions from the floor?

25 Eric, they just found was it four or five -- my

00043

1 numbers are so bad, the 2.36, they found them about a year
2 ago, and you blew them.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: The 2.36, the one that was armed,
4 that Greg was talking about, was found up near the demolition
5 site.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you want to tell everybody about
7 the ones you just blew?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: It was actually a practice item.
9 The one that made all that noise?

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes. We got shook pretty badly.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. That one was probably a
12 practice item. I asked EoD to take care of it anyway. The
13 way they took care of it was a little bit louder than I had
14 hoped for. So those are the only two that have been found up
15 there.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: That was west of Lacamas.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Those are the ones reported from
18 Phase I sticking out of the stump. It's that one. It was one
19 rocket body that was sitting at the bottom.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Then pieces of metal, railroad spike
22 and other things.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Those wouldn't be considered
24 harmless, right?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, to be honest, I don't know

00044

1 if they're harmless or not.
2 KAREN KINGSTON: I have the EoD report someplace and
3 they said they weren't harmless.
4 ERIC WAEHLING: They said they couldn't determine
5 it. That's why they blew it, to be on the safe side.
6 KAREN KINGSTON: Is that the way you feel, Greg?
7 ERIC WAEHLING: They treated it just like it was.
8 KAREN KINGSTON: They did?
9 ERIC WAEHLING: That's the same way --
10 KAREN KINGSTON: He said there were practice rounds
11 they found that they blew up there. Just to reiterate,
12 practice rounds are not harmless?
13 GREG JOHNSON: Practice rounds are harmful.
14 KAREN KINGSTON: Are harmful?
15 GREG JOHNSON: Yes. Some of them can be just as
16 deadly.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: Unless you x-ray them. Those were
18 in a position where they couldn't be x-rayed.
19 GREG JOHNSON: They don't always have to be x-rayed
20 either. There are other ways of telling whether or not what
21 it is. There's color codes, measuring where the bands are.
22 EoD tech says it's live ordnance, it's live ordnance.
23 ERIC WAEHLING: Which is why they did what they did.
24 KAREN KINGSTON: Shall we take a break and then
25 we'll give the whole floor to the County, go on with the

00045

1 presentation there. Any more questions to field towards Greg?
2 Otherwise we'll move on. Okay, then we'll take a 10-minute
3 break.

4 (Pause in proceedings.)

5 ERIC WAEHLING: If we could get started, please.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Thank you. I appreciate Greg's
7 presentation. I also want to thank the members of the
8 community that are here tonight. I appreciate you coming and
9 being involved.

10 Can I introduce to you Judie Stanton. She's our
11 Clark County Commissioner. I'll just let her go ahead and
12 roll with the presentation.

13 FRANK FUNK: I got a question. On the predetermined
14 questions, I want to address that before it's discussed.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: You want to address the
16 predetermined questions?

17 FRANK FUNK: Not necessarily the questions, but
18 about them being here.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: We're not going to discuss it
20 tonight, but you can make a statement into the record. We're
21 not going to discuss it tonight.

22 FRANK FUNK: Great. Well, let me make a statement
23 about it then.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Fine.

25 FRANK FUNK: That is contrary to the rules that you

00046

1 referred to, the guidance. It should not be before the RAB.
2 There are only about four items in there that would pertain to
3 the RAB. If you look at your RAB, you call them rules,
4 they're guidances, page two, 3.2, the lead paragraph, the
5 second dot, Item 5, the eighth dot, the top of page three,
6 they address restoration, they do not address the issues that
7 are contained in that. That's a form that should be presented
8 by the County some other time, not here. You say we're not
9 going to discuss it.
10 Page six, 5.0, it says in part a RAB should focus on
11 environmental restoration only and is not to be a forum for
12 other community concerns. There's too many community concerns
13 outside of what the RAB is supposed to do.
14 On page nine, 6.0, operating procedures, RAB should
15 not become a sounding board for non-restoration environmental
16 issues or the -- of community concerns.
17 In the omission statement on page 10, 6.1, at a
18 minimum, final plans related to the cleanup.
19 That proposed question thing, predetermined
20 questions, does not relate to RAB activities.
21 The fourth dot provides input on priorities amongst
22 sites or projects. This is outside the site.
23 The fifth, proposed cleanup, page 10, proposed
24 cleanup level consistent with land use. If the RAB does its
25 job, the issues of safety, if we do our job, it will take care

00047

1 of the trail safety that the young lady is concerned about.
2 Page 11, 7.0, RABs are only to address restoration
3 uses at the installation. We're only to address issues at the
4 installation.
5 You have that on the agenda at 8:20 p.m.,
6 predetermined questions, see attachment, pertaining to
7 questions and comments not already covered. This would be out
8 of the order for RAB activity functions.
9 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay, thank you. Is that your
10 statement?
11 FRANK FUNK: That's it.
12 KAREN KINGSTON: We're going to go ahead with these.
13 I'm correcting Frank, and that's the end of the discussion at
14 this point because this was already arranged. On page 23, it
15 discusses land reuse, and we are supposed to interact with the
16 LRA. We're going to go ahead.
17 These were questions that were given to me by the
18 community and different RAB members. We're going to have
19 Judie answer as many, whatever she can do with these. These
20 were not my questions. We're here on behalf of the community,
21 as well. So we'll go ahead and start with the presentation.
22 JUDIE STANTON: I'm going to go over here because I
23 don't like having my back to all of you. This is just more
24 comfortable.
25 Good evening. Again, I'd like to introduce the

00048

1 County team who is here this evening. We are the core team
2 within the County who are working on the next steps with Camp
3 Bonneville.
4 I'm Judie Stanton. I'm the County Commissioner for
5 the east part of the County, basically 205 east to the
6 Skamania County line, then south of Hockinson. That's how I
7 wound up in the position that I am working through this
8 process.
9 Bill Barron is our County administrator. He has
10 accompanied me on trips to the Pentagon as we start to talk
11 about getting the camp site cleaned up, how we might best get
12 it done.
13 Pete Capell is the director of Public Works. He has
14 also been to Washington with me.
15 Bronson Potter, from the prosecutor's office, has
16 been dealing with all of the legal work related to the
17 discussions we've been having with the Army about early
18 transfer.
19 Then in the back corner, Brian Vincent, who is the
20 project manager, he works in Public Works and has a lot of
21 project management experience. He's the project manager on
22 this.
23 I can't leave out Jeroen Kok with our Parks and
24 Recreation department. Jeroen has been serving on the RAB,
25 how long?

00049

1 JEROEN KOK: About three and a half years.

2 JUDIE STANTON: Three and a half years now, right.

3 I'm sorry, we have Don Strick from our public

4 information office. I knew if I didn't write it down, I would

5 not get everybody. Don is working on a process for keeping

6 the general public informed as to where we're going and how

7 we're proceeding.

8 I want to go back and start as to how the County

9 ever became involved in this whole thing. I think that's

10 important because the work that's being done by the RAB is to

11 see that the cleanup at the camp happens so that the reuse

12 that has been determined can be implemented.

13 This really started in 1995 when Congress decided

14 that Camp Bonneville would be added to the BRAC list. That's

15 basically the base reuse and closure process. It was no

16 longer needed, so therefore it went on the list.

17 After it went on the list, the Federal Government

18 determined who the local reuse authority was going to be. The

19 local redevelopment authority in this case was appointed, the

20 Board of County Commissioners, the three Commissioners who

21 were sitting at the time, none of whom are still on the board,

22 were appointed to fill that role. That's the official link

23 between the Federal Government and the local process.

24 The Board of County Commissioners, also known as the

25 Local Redevelopment Authority, went to the community then and

00050

1 set up a process to try to determine what the reuse or the
2 redevelopment of this more than three thousand acres currently
3 owned by the Army would be. So they set up a series of
4 steering committees. Bob, you're still here. Bob must have
5 gone to more of these steering committee meetings than anybody
6 else that I can think of right away.

7 ROBERT TORRENS: Bob has since found a life.

8 JUDIE STANTON: The board appointed two members of a
9 Reuse Planning Committee. There's a local redevelopment
10 authority, then there's the Reuse Planning Committee. That
11 was a five-member board. It was made up of two members who
12 were appointed by the Governor and two members who were
13 appointed by the County, then the chair of that board was the
14 Commissioner from the east County.

15 That group then, the five members, put together a
16 series of subcommittees that worked on all different kinds of
17 topics, from financial aspects of redevelopment to
18 environmental concerns, to what kinds of activities. There
19 were a number of subcommittees. The chairs of the
20 subcommittees made up the steering committee basically. The
21 steering committee met more regularly as a group to relate
22 then back to the five-member board.

23 During that process they had about 250 individuals,
24 citizens from across Clark County, involved in a process of
25 trying to determine what the reuse would be of these better

00051

1 than three thousand acres in the east part of the County.
2 They had between them more than 80 meetings that are in our
3 records. We were staffing these meetings at the time and have
4 fairly good records of the process that they went through to
5 try to determine what would be used out there or what the use
6 of the land would be.
7 There were several applications that came forward
8 from different groups that proposed that the land be
9 transferred to them. Two of them I remember were tribes, one
10 was Clark College, one was Clark County, and I'll be darned if
11 I can remember what the fifth one was. Right now -- I was
12 trying to think of that tonight.
13 DON WASTLER: The Native Americans.
14 JUDIE STANTON: There were two tribes. I remember
15 we had two tribes, so that would have been the Native American
16 groups. The County put in a proposal. Clark College put in a
17 proposal. There was another one, a fifth one.
18 The groups met for about two and a half years and
19 they put together a plan. That plan was that this almost
20 three thousand acres would be basically -- would basically
21 become a park area and it would made up of the kinds of
22 activities that were light on the ground, was the way they
23 described it a lot of the time.
24 There were a lot of requests from groups that wanted
25 to do hand gliding off of the higher points out there, model

00052

1 airplane clubs that wanted to run model airplanes, paint ball
2 enthusiasts that wanted to have paint ball within the trees,
3 those kinds of things.
4 What they always were conscious of was the fact that
5 this whole land was not going to be used for human
6 interaction, that there was a good portion of it that would
7 remain for wildlife. That was a result of a letter that had
8 come during the process, the early process of the reuse
9 discussions, that was from Fish and Wildlife, that basically
10 said it could become a nice sanctuary for wildlife. At the
11 time they backed off and said what the County is proposing is
12 very much like what they would like to see happen out there,
13 so we're going to let the County go forward with their
14 proposal.
15 So a large portion of the area is set aside for
16 wildlife, then there are the more active parts of the park,
17 the land out there, that have been used in the past for Boy
18 Scout groups to go out there, 4-H clubs have been out there,
19 outdoor school has been held out there. There have been a lot
20 of community activities on the site during the time it was
21 actively in the hands of the Army.
22 After the plan was pulled together and the
23 recognition was made that the County was growing fast in
24 population, and we have a standard for the amount of park
25 lands that we needed to have for the public, we were short

00053

1 about a thousand acres of regional park land. So the
2 recommendation came forward from the planning group that said
3 this should be transferred to Clark County and it should
4 become a regional park.

5 So after the plan was put together, and it was in
6 its draft form, the Reuse Planning Committee, again that
7 five-member board, went out and held public hearings around
8 the community to get comments on the plan. Then they
9 finalized it, sent it to the Board of County Commissioners
10 acting as the redevelopment authority, that went through
11 another hearing, then adopted the plan, sent that plan forward
12 to the Army.

13 So from there, I'm going ask Pete Capell to go into
14 the discussion about where we've taken it from the time the
15 plan was submitted in 1998.

16 PETE CAPELL: Thanks, Judie.

17 One of the things that Judie described was kind of a
18 little bit of your second question, which was how Camp
19 Bonneville will suit our County's needs, and that we clearly
20 have a significant deficit in our regional park system, and
21 this roughly 800 acres of the Camp Bonneville site that is
22 designated as a future regional park will go along ways to
23 satisfying that particular requirement.

24 Because she had been involved through all of that
25 process, and I really came into this much later on, I'm going

00054

1 to talk a little bit more about what early transfer is and how
2 we had gotten from where Judie described the process to where
3 we're at today.
4 Clearly our original plan was that the Army would
5 clean up the site to both the satisfaction of the Army and the
6 satisfaction of the Department of Ecology, and when it was
7 clean, then the land would then transfer to the County at that
8 particular time, then the redevelopment work can take place
9 for this reuse of the property. That was our plan.
10 But there's a number of things that have changed
11 since then. One is that the military -- one of the things we
12 talked about when we went back to the Pentagon, is that they
13 are going to be going back to Congress with a list of new
14 sites that are going to be put on the BRAC list. They have
15 not done, admittedly by them, a very good job of getting the
16 original BRAC sites transferred and off of their inventory, so
17 they are very eager to start really making some more progress
18 and moving forward with that. So that's one thing that's
19 caused them to be extremely motivated.
20 The other thing that compounds that is their budget
21 is being significantly reduced in the Army BRAC office. In
22 this current fiscal year, which ends the end of September, the
23 Federal fiscal year, so fiscal year '03, they have \$250
24 million budgeted for BRAC.
25 FY '04, fiscal year '04, next year, that's going to

00055

1 be cut to about \$75 million to \$80 million is what they've
2 told us. Then further out in '06, we're looking at that being
3 further reduced to \$30 million.
4 We don't know what the cost of this cleanup is going
5 to be, but you've heard various numbers thrown around. They
6 have a number of sites across the country. When they've only
7 got \$75 million to \$80 million a year, then further out \$30
8 million, they're going to be really limited to be able to
9 clean up this site.
10 So at that point we're talking to them, and really
11 it was suggested to us by representatives of the Army that
12 another option to clean up the site would be early transfer.
13 As you know, we've been actively working on this since '96.
14 It's 2003 now. We still have a long ways to go. If their
15 budgets are going to be cut, we don't see the site being
16 cleaned up in the foreseeable future for redevelopment and
17 reuse. So that was one of the things that motivated us to
18 move ahead. Then after a detailed review of what was entailed
19 with early transfer, the County requested that an early
20 transfer be made for Camp Bonneville.
21 Let me give you a little bit of background as to
22 what an early transfer would entail. One is that the Army
23 would transfer it to us as is, that's as is at the particular
24 time of the transfer. Eric has talked about the demolition
25 site being cleaned up, so that's likely to be done in advance

00056

1 of the transfer. So that would be one piece of work that the
2 County wouldn't have to do, but as is whatever the transfer
3 date is.

4 The Army will provide the money for the cleanup and
5 related work. One of the things about the money is that it
6 would be appropriated with that '03 budget, which is the
7 current \$250 million. The actual payments to Clark County
8 would be through reimbursement of actual expenditures with
9 oversight of the Army, so they can obligate those current
10 fiscal year budgets for the cleanup of Camp Bonneville even
11 though it's going to take years to finish all of the
12 characterization in the cleanup plan as you kind of heard from
13 Greg. There's still a lot of site work that needs to be done
14 before we're physically cleaning it up, but those monies would
15 be obligated and set aside for this particular cleanup.
16 Again, I think an important thing, one of the
17 questions that came back is that there will be significant
18 oversight by the Army of those monies and how they're spent,
19 and those monies really can only be spent on cleanup activity.
20 The other thing that's included in those monies is
21 the cost of risk insurance to protect the County against
22 long-term general and environmental liability as well as
23 protection of cost overruns. As we go through this process,
24 an estimate will be prepared for the cost of the cleanup, to
25 include the insurance and all of the other related activities.

00057

1 Well, as you hear some of the discussions, there's
2 still a lot of work to do, so it's going to be an estimate,
3 and the actual cost is going to be based on -- the actual cost
4 could be more and it could be less, but we can get insurance
5 that will protect the County against that cost overrun.
6 The Department of Ecology issued an Enforcement
7 Order for the Army to clean up the site. The requirements of
8 that order will be transferred to the County through a
9 prepurchase agreement, then the site will be cleaned up in
10 compliance with Department of Ecology standards, again also
11 with the Army as a partner, as well.
12 One of the other things that's really important is
13 the Army is still the responsible agency. If something is
14 discovered through the course of this work that wasn't
15 anticipated, the Army is still responsible, and we would go
16 back to the Army for the monies to clean up something that
17 wasn't identified in this particular agreement. So finally,
18 you know, the County, the Department of Ecology and the Army
19 will work together to clean up the site.
20 Some of the benefits, and the reasons that we've
21 pursued this, one is that with the current funding scenarios
22 as we see it, this gives the community greater certainty that
23 there will be funds available to clean up Camp Bonneville.
24 The site will be cleaned up in a timely manner, probably much
25 more timely, based on current experience, than what we've

00058

1 experienced to date. It will be paid for by the Army and
2 monitored by the Department of Ecology in conjunction with the
3 County. There will be a lot of oversight in that particular
4 activity.

5 I believe, and time will tell, but I think for local
6 government to do that and have local controls, we're likely to
7 be able to do that work for less money than it might have cost
8 for the Army to do it with controlling it from outside of the
9 area.

10 As a benefit to the Army, it will be then removed
11 from their inventory. It will allow an earlier cleanup, a
12 more rapid cleanup, so that property becomes put back into a
13 beneficial public use.

14 Then several other things that I think are really
15 critical to us because there's been a lot of discussion about
16 some of the hazards and so forth. Well, we recognize, and I
17 think there's been discussions here, that even though there's
18 a fence line, the fence line is far from perfect, and there
19 are a lot of people that go back in there now anyway. The
20 hazards and the concerns that we're talking about exist
21 whether it's transferred or it's not transferred. If this
22 gets mothballed, then the cleanup isn't going to occur, the
23 hazards are out there, and the community and those people that
24 are crossing the fence line are going to be at some risk,
25 where this will allow the cleanup to occur and prevent that

00059

1 from happening.
2 Another very paramount concern of ours is because of
3 the ordnances out there and the fact that it hasn't been
4 cleaned up, if there were a fire out there, the current
5 practice is to protect it at the fence line. We're not going
6 to have firefighters that are going to go in and fight fire
7 inside at potential risk and harm to them. So one of the
8 things that will happen, the site gets cleaned up, we will
9 have a timber management plan to be able to thin out and clean
10 out the underbrush and try and protect it from the potential
11 for wildfires and the hazards that exist.
12 So based on that, we really believe that early
13 transfer is a very good option because the cleanup is going to
14 occur and occur in a timely manner. Our alternative is that
15 it gets mothballed or not mothballed but maybe cleaned up over
16 20- or 30- or longer year period of time. Those risks are
17 still out there. Just because it hasn't been transferred,
18 there's still a risk out there.
19 I guess I'll follow up. One of the things we did
20 take the liberty to do, because there was a lot of questions,
21 and to go through the questions one at a time, we're about 20
22 minutes away from your adjournment, we took the liberty of
23 actually responding to each of the questions in writing.
24 Brian has copies of those that he can distribute. It might be
25 easier if people have an opportunity to review the responses.

00060

1 I suspect that the person who is recording this might
2 appreciate it, as well, not having to record all of that data,
3 and then we can just answer questions that might come as a
4 result of our answers or other questions.
5 KAREN KINGSTON: We have the room until 10. It's
6 part of our thing to be able to be here until then if we have
7 to.
8 What does everybody think?
9 VALERIE LANE: I think we should hand the answers
10 out.
11 DON WASTLER: Pass them out.
12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can I ask a question from his
13 presentation or do I need to wait? What's the protocol?
14 KAREN KINGSTON: I would imagine it's probably a
15 good idea to ask a question just on his presentation. I
16 probably wouldn't go into any of the questions for their sake.
17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I had a question about the
18 cleanup of underbrush you mentioned. Will, say, a controlled
19 burn occur after or before a surface --
20 PETE CAPELL: Those are certainly specific details
21 that I can't answer. I mean, that would have to be part of
22 the whole plan.
23 JUDIE STANTON: We didn't say anything about a
24 controlled burn. We're talking about ongoing maintenance of
25 the land over time.

00061

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: There's a number of hazards
2 attributed to a controlled burn with UXO on the ground.

3 JUDIE STANTON: He didn't say that.

4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I have one more. You talked
5 about if this project is mothballed, there's no cleanup of UXO
6 or groundwater, continued cleanup. I just wanted to know,
7 Eric, if it's mothballed, I understand that you mentioned at
8 meetings if it's mothballed, the cleanup of UXO on the surface
9 and groundwater would still be addressed.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Potentially certainly the
11 groundwater would continue to be addressed. One of the things
12 I'd like to specify, one of the differences between how we
13 approached the decision making in the historic EE/CA about the
14 way we're going forward now, we're taking the approach now
15 that reuse is what's going to drive cleanup. In other words,
16 this site will be safe. I want to clarify, because I didn't
17 do a very good job. When you asked me if it would be 100%, my
18 technical hat went on.

19 For my personal sleep and well-being, this site will
20 be safe. It will be safe for reuse, whatever that reuse ends
21 up being. In this case, the reuse in front of us that's the
22 most probable is the County Reuse Plan as a park. So no
23 matter what happens to the property, there are certain legal
24 obligations we have to meet. The ongoing groundwater work
25 would have to continue. Ecology would insist upon it. What

00062

1 Ecology would insist upon if the facility were mothballed
2 versus being used as a park, I can't answer that because we
3 haven't had that discussion. Our legal obligations would
4 continue. We'd have to meet those, no matter what.
5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I thought we've had the
6 discussion that if it was mothballed, the hazards -- the fence
7 would be severely updated and the surface UXO would be
8 addressed. Am I wrong?
9 KAREN KINGSTON: Isn't Ecology going to stay
10 involved? The cleanup is happening as far as Ecology is
11 concerned, is it not? It doesn't matter about the County
12 taking it, is that correct?
13 FRANK FUNK: Chris said from the State EPA it would
14 be cleaned up regardless of what happens.
15 DON WASTLER: That's right.
16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That's what I'm trying to
17 say.
18 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army would have to continue to
19 meet legal obligations as far as cleanup. Again, as I said
20 earlier, as is the case with any cleanup, reuse, future
21 exposure determines what you have to do. What that is, I
22 couldn't tell you right now from a mothball scenario.
23 JEROEN KOK: It seems to me the rate and the extent
24 to which you can perform the cleanup are going to be limited
25 by the budget that you have available.

00063

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Dollars, absolutely.
2 KAREN KINGSTON: Take longer to do, but still be
3 done, right?
4 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah. I mean, I'll be perfectly
5 honest. From what I'm being told, it could be years and
6 years, decades. If it's not being transferred off -- if it's
7 not being --
8 The Army is going to apply the dollars where it's
9 going to be able to accomplish what it needs to accomplish
10 directed by Congress.
11 KAREN KINGSTON: You're speaking of cleanup?
12 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.
13 KAREN KINGSTON: You're not talking about mitigating
14 the water contamination that could possibly potentially be --
15 be a potential threat to the nearby community? You're not
16 talking about that?
17 ERIC WAEHLING: No, I'm not talking about that. I'm
18 talking about what would need to be done for redevelopment by
19 the community.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: Redevelopment.
21 ERIC WAEHLING: I'll say it again with emphasis.
22 The Army would have to continue to meet its legal
23 requirements.
24 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.
25 ERIC WAEHLING: To include groundwater

00064

1 contamination. That's very important.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: You're not saying if the County
3 doesn't get it that you're off the hook?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: No.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: That you're not going to take care
6 of us?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: You're still taking care of it no
9 matter what?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But this does represent an
11 opportunity to assure that the cleanup happens sooner rather
12 than later and under direct control by the community rather
13 than somebody back in the Pentagon.

14 COLEEN BROAD: You had mentioned, Pete, one of the
15 reasons the County was interested is not only the cleanup but
16 because we need more park and recreation because of the growth
17 of the County.

18 If for some chance Camp Bonneville does fall
19 through, does the County have a Plan B for land somewhere
20 else? I was just curious. Is there something else being
21 considered? Is the County believing nothing needs to be
22 considered because you're moving forward?

23 PETE CAPELL: Jeroen, you might be able to answer
24 that much better than I could.

25 JEROEN KOK: We have a Regional Parks, Recreation

00065

1 and Open Space Comprehensive Plan which directs our effort to
2 provide for regional parks, regional trails, and a number of
3 other recreation and special use facilities throughout the
4 County. We have identified other sites other than Camp
5 Bonneville which potentially could be acquired for regional
6 park use. However, we've got extremely limited funding
7 sources to go out and acquire those other properties.
8 Camp Bonneville at this time represents our best
9 opportunity to get some significant regional park acres in the
10 inventory to meet our current deficit.

11 COLEEN BROAD: When it's in the inventory, even
12 though it hasn't been cleaned up, does it meet whatever quotas
13 you need to meet? When you acquire the park, but we can't
14 access the park because it's still a dirty piece of land, it
15 hasn't been characterized or cleaned, does that meet your
16 quota? I don't know when your quota -- do you understand?

17 JUDIE STANTON: Yes, I do. I mean, after a fashion
18 it does meet the quota. Right now the County is in the
19 process of buying parcels all over this County in the
20 unincorporated areas for future parks, for neighborhood use,
21 for community use, ball fields, those kinds of things. We own
22 a lot of land.

23 COLEEN BROAD: The intention means you meet the
24 quota because the intention means it will be clean, whether
25 it's 10 or 20 years that you clean it?

00066

1 JUDIE STANTON: We will develop the park plan that
2 we have already purchased over a number of years anyway. So,
3 yes, this would be added to that same inventory.

4 COLEEN BROAD: Thank you.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Ian Ray and then out to the
6 audience, too.

7 IAN RAY: The Army calls the response actions things
8 that are done to fix something that's needed to be done. In
9 the situation of early transfer being a fact and actually
10 working, who decides what response actions are done? Is it
11 the Army or the Department of Ecology?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Who are you asking?

13 IAN RAY: How are disputes settled?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Bronson.

15 BRONSON POTTER: Bronson Potter with the
16 prosecutor's office. There's a civil division of the
17 prosecutor's office, and that's how I get involved.
18 The Enforcement Order that's been issued by Ecology
19 has a process where there's an investigation phase, there's a
20 Cleanup Action Plan prepared, which is the responses kind of
21 you're talking about, and the Army prepares these plans and
22 gives them to Ecology for review and approval.
23 The process under the Enforcement Order is Ecology
24 will comment on those. It may require a modification to the
25 draft plan. Eventually that plan becomes an approved cleanup

00067

1 plan. Then the Enforcement Order also has a dispute
2 resolution process in it.
3 IAN RAY: Thank you.
4 KAREN KINGSTON: Don.
5 DON WASTLER: I'd just like to say I think Clark
6 County gave an excellent presentation of the written answers
7 to the questions. It's excellent. In the future, if we can
8 kind of keep a communication back and forth between each
9 other, I think it's great.
10 PETE CAPELL: I have to give credit to Brian
11 Vincent. He's the one who put all the hours in.
12 DON WASTLER: It sure saves a lot of time.
13 KAREN KINGSTON: Is it Barbara?
14 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: Barbara Corigliano. I'm a
15 concerned neighbor. I have several questions because several
16 things have gone through.
17 First, what is the practice for informing the
18 residents in the closest proximity of Camp Bonneville into
19 what is going on and what's being done, what's being decided,
20 within the five-mile radius, the people that their property
21 values are affected by something that may be contaminated,
22 more shooting ranges in the future? We already have one
23 shooting range. To have 18 more going on all the time back
24 there, it's not very appealing to me.
25 I mean, I have not gotten one written communication

00068

1 from anybody, with me being so close to this property, with
2 anything that's going on. I don't have the time to read the
3 paper every single day for the little announcement you may put
4 in the legal notice here.

5 JUDIE STANTON: We'd be happy to spend time with you
6 to talk about what is actually proposed in the Reuse Plan.
7 There is one small firing range and an FBI range. The 18
8 ranges they were talking about earlier are pre-existing when
9 it was used by the Army. You really need to see what it is
10 that's being proposed.

11 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: I'd like to see that. I'd like
12 to be notified as a taxpaying resident so closely affected by
13 this area. When I bought my property up there, I had no idea
14 it was even there. I came from the East Coast. I bought the
15 property and had no idea. I read a lot of my legal documents.

16 DON WASTLER: Jeroen Kok has copies of the Clark
17 County's Reuse Plan. I believe all that information is in
18 there, isn't it?

19 JEROEN KOK: I can provide you a copy.

20 JUDIE STANTON: But your question is from here on
21 out, how do you keep informed about what's going on. That is
22 Don's communications plan.

23 DON STRICK: We do have a variety of tools to make
24 sure people are kept in the loop.

25 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: Written? Addressed to?

00069

1 DON STRICK: We will prepare a variety of printed
2 materials. We are going to be starting a newsletter. We
3 definitely want to get a list of people, concerned neighbors
4 such as yourself, RAB members and others, on our mailing list.
5 We will be identifying the issues. We want to hear what your
6 concerns are. That's part of my function in attending these
7 meetings. We definitely welcome the dialogue. We want to
8 hear from you, too, as much as possible.
9 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: How would we get on this
10 newsletter if we don't know a lot of this that's going on?
11 DON STRICK: Well, I'm going to be looking into ways
12 of developing this newsletter mailing list. But certainly
13 this is a start. If you want to give me your name and
14 address.
15 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: How about the tax records for
16 that precinct?
17 DON STRICK: I'll be contacting neighbors.
18 PETE CAPELL: I might add one more thing, too. As
19 Commissioner Stanton mentioned, there was an extensive public
20 process in the development of the plan. From there on, we
21 were looking at then implementing that plan after the Army
22 cleaned up the site. This has become a relatively new
23 situation that's been brought forward, new condition that's
24 been brought forward. We were trying to do our due diligence
25 to make sure that we believed that it was in the best interest

00070

1 of the community.

2 We just recently brought Don on board to the team

3 because now we are moving forward with this, and we need to

4 then do our communication and outreach to let people know.

5 But it's all happened just very recently. That's why you may

6 not have known about it previously. There had been extensive

7 communication and public outreach.

8 JUDIE STANTON: Another resource, if you want to

9 take a look at the County's website, there is a lot of

10 information about Camp Bonneville. You find --

11 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: I've been there.

12 JUDIE STANTON: There's hopefully e-mail access so

13 you can communicate with us there, too.

14 DON WASTLER: Also the Vancouver Mall library.

15 Almost everything that's happened is documented there at the

16 Vancouver Mall library. We've just now tried to get all that

17 indexed into where you can go in there and look something up

18 and find it.

19 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: Here is my concern with all

20 this information you tell me I can get everywhere. How many

21 more people that live close to me or around me don't even know

22 any of this is going on?

23 JUDIE STANTON: There might be quite a few. A lot

24 of new neighbors, that's right.

25 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: It seems if you did a data sort

00071

1 on our tax records, pinpointed that area, communicated with a
2 letter of some type to get the community aware, you might have
3 a lot more opposition than what you think you have.
4 Pete, where do you live? What area?
5 PETE CAPELL: I live in Vancouver.
6 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: Where at?
7 JUDIE STANTON: How is this relevant?
8 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: It's just that if it's
9 something that's being proposed to be put in your backyard, I
10 think you might be thinking about it differently.
11 JUDIE STANTON: It's being put in my backyard. I've
12 been asked personally as a neighbor, I've got other relatives
13 that live in the area, as well, would I like a regional park.
14 That's what I'm talking about. I've lived out in the area for
15 the last 13 years. In fact, during the time when you could
16 still see parachutes when the Army was using it, you could
17 hear them practicing there on the weekends. If you've just
18 moved there recently, you missed all that part.
19 What we're talking about right now is better than
20 three thousand acres of vacant land. It's got buildings on
21 it, barracks, facilities there that we'd like to be able to
22 turn into something that could be used for outdoor schools.
23 Currently our kids have to go to another County to have
24 outdoor schools. We have a proposal that's all-encompassing
25 that was done after a big public process to take it from my

00072

1 getting to watch people parachute into the area to a place
2 where my grandson can go to outdoor school.

3 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: In some of the reports --

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: There's a new neighborhood
5 association that's just been formed, Livingston. Get in touch
6 with this lady and she will put you in touch with the people
7 involved.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Did you have another question,
9 Barbara?

10 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: I did. Can't remember off the
11 top of my head.

12 If the park and rec is currently working in a
13 deficit, why are we proposing that we take on more?

14 JUDIE STANTON: The deficit we were referring to
15 were total acres available.

16 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: Not financial deficit?

17 JUDIE STANTON: No, the acreage available for parks.
18 We're about a thousand acres short. We have a measure adopted
19 through public process. We say in Clark County we value parks
20 to this extent, we'd like to have this many acres per resident
21 for regional parks. That's the deficit that we're talking
22 about, is in total acreage.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: When this process was
24 presented to the County four years ago, is that about the time
25 frame that you put together the land reuse?

00073

1 JUDIE STANTON: Started in 1996, then it was adopted
2 by the board in 1998 and sent to the Army, yes.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The recent new development is
4 early transfer. Do you feel it is fair to pursue and
5 undertake this without actually having really, besides today,
6 anyone understanding the process, wanting to take on that risk
7 and liability?

8 JUDIE STANTON: Nothing has changed in terms of
9 reuse. The reuse is just exactly as the citizens put it
10 together, as the board adopted it after hearings. The reuse
11 is a regional park.

12 The thing that we have done a little bit of is to
13 make certain that we're a lot closer when we talk about where
14 the buildings will go, where the lines for utilities to serve
15 the area will go, those kinds of things. The plan has been
16 refined just a little bit. But the charge that we were given
17 was to turn this into a regional park. So we've been waiting
18 until it's cleaned up.

19 We have an opportunity right now, and certainly I
20 hear from people, the big anniversary of the Yacolt burn
21 didn't keep people exactly quiet of, "What are you doing to
22 manage that potential forest fire over there at Camp
23 Bonneville?" There's concern about wells and contamination to
24 wells. I've got a well downstream of Camp Bonneville. I have
25 an interest in that, as well.

00074

1 We have entered into an agreement with the sheriff
2 that we would respond when there are calls from people who
3 notice trespassers going onto the site, so we dispatch our
4 sheriff to go and see if there's somebody on-site.
5 We've got some expense already incurred here. What
6 we see this as is an opportunity to get rid of a liability,
7 which is a lot of land that's contaminated, and turn it into
8 an asset for the community.
9 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you look at the liability
10 as the fire and that liability completely different from the
11 liability you will be taking on from the early transfer?
12 JUDIE STANTON: The liability that we'll be taking
13 on from the early transfer is no different than what we have
14 today, very frankly. There are more than three thousand acres
15 of land in Clark County that need to be cleaned up, okay?
16 It's still in Clark County. It's still a concern of mine,
17 whether it's the Army over a long period of time cleaning it
18 up or whether we get it and we hire a contractor to go in
19 there and do the work. I'd rather get rid of the risk sooner
20 rather than later.
21 COLEEN BROAD: Number seven, if can you help with
22 clarification, where you were going with that. It says in the
23 event an insurance company drops coverage, can Clark County
24 risk financial responsibility? The County answers, "The
25 County will not place itself into such a position." Also,

00075

1 "Army is actually responsible for cleanup."

2 You'll have to help me here. I'm kind of confused.

3 We take the land but the Army is responsible ultimately for

4 the cleanup, so if there's any bad faith in the insurance

5 company or there's an overrun and you've --

6 JUDIE STANTON: It always goes back to the Army,

7 yes.

8 COLEEN BROAD: How is that?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: I can clarify it. Anything the Army

10 has put there, the Army is forever responsible for. It's

11 really that simple.

12 COLEEN BROAD: So if there is a UXO that five years

13 from now somehow damages someone or something, it's not the

14 County's responsibility, it would be the Army's?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army is ultimately responsible

16 for that.

17 BRONSON POTTER: Can I chime in on that?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

19 BRONSON POTTER: There's two provisions in the

20 Federal law. One is CERCLA, which is a Federal law on

21 cleanup. That does make the person who contaminates the

22 property responsible for its cleanup even after they transfer

23 ownership of it. That's the answer to that question, why we

24 keep saying the Army is ultimately responsible. That's from

25 that CERCLA law.

00076

1 There was also a law that was adopted as part of a
2 defense budget reauthorization. What it did was said that
3 specifically with respect to any third-party claims, a claim
4 for a person who comes onto the property and is injured by any
5 hazardous waste left on the site, that the person who created
6 the hazardous waste is responsible for the claim of that third
7 party, again, even after transfer of ownership of the
8 property.
9 On the insurance question, one of the insurance
10 products that we will be looking at acquiring is a pollution
11 liability coverage and UXO coverage. There's only a couple,
12 two or three insurance companies in the world that are writing
13 this, but they happen to be two or three of the biggest
14 insurance companies in the world. So I'm not sure what the
15 bad faith was in reference to.
16 COLEEN BROAD: If the Army is ultimately
17 responsible, why would the County go through and go through
18 the expense? I'm sure this policy is going to cost us
19 millions. Why would we acquire that, if the Army is
20 ultimately responsible?
21 BRONSON POTTER: Part of the cost of insurance is
22 what we can build into the cost that we recover from the Army.
23 COLEEN BROAD: The Army will be paying for that
24 policy?
25 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

00077

1 BRONSON POTTER: The only other insurance product
2 that I'll mention, I think Pete did mention it, is the cost
3 overrun, cost cap insurance.
4 COLEEN BROAD: Right.
5 BRONSON POTTER: If there is more costs involved in
6 the cleanup than we anticipated or estimated, that's an
7 insurance policy that we can look to for recovery, again paid
8 for by the Army.
9 COLEEN BROAD: So we're not the first County to be
10 acquiring this type of coverage?
11 BRONSON POTTER: No.
12 COLEEN BROAD: This type of coverage has been
13 written before from a property transferred?
14 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.
15 PETE CAPELL: One thing of interest, too, we talk
16 about the Army's oversight. That insurance carrier is going
17 to do a great deal of work to make sure that they're not
18 taking a risk on themselves. That's another independent, very
19 detailed review that things are being taken care of
20 appropriately. Through that insurance coverage, we also get
21 an additional benefit.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: Mr. Potter, are you familiar with
23 the case down at Tierra Santa with the two children that died?
24 BRONSON POTTER: No.
25 KAREN KINGSTON: It's in San Diego. Could I just

00078

1 ask you to review it at some point? I have the documentation
2 on it. When those children -- they said in their summary
3 pretty much everything you just said. The only thing is that
4 the County paid \$2 million, the State paid \$2 million and then
5 the military paid \$2 million. They did spread the liability,
6 and that set precedent, right?
7 BRONSON POTTER: I don't know anything about the
8 case you're talking about, so I won't agree with "right."
9 KAREN KINGSTON: I understand that.
10 BRONSON POTTER: But I'd be happy to look at it. If
11 you can give me information on it.
12 DON WASTLER: Now you know why we elected her
13 co-chair.
14 KAREN KINGSTON: I saw hands.
15 LOREN CARLSON: Loren Carlson. Simple question. As
16 a taxpayer, is this going to cost me any money?
17 PETE CAPELL: The answer --
18 LOREN CARLSON: The answer should be yes or no or
19 maybe.
20 PETE CAPELL: My only hesitation is that the Army is
21 going to pay for the cleanup.
22 LOREN CARLSON: You're also talking about the budget
23 cuts and everything the government is undertaking. It's a
24 real simple question: Is it going to cost me as a taxpayer
25 any money?

00079

1 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: More money than you're paying
2 now?
3 LOREN CARLSON: Yeah.
4 ERIC WAEHLING: The operation or the cleanup?
5 LOREN CARLSON: The cleanup.
6 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: All of it.
7 LOREN CARLSON: The cleanup, is it going to cost me
8 more money as a taxpayer? That's a yes or no answer.
9 PETE CAPELL: The reason I hesitate is it it's not
10 going to cost you more, but I hesitate because you also pay
11 Federal taxes which pays for part of this. The other thing
12 that happens is that the Army will pay the County for the
13 insurance and for the cleanup and so forth. We are going to
14 have to redevelop the site for park use. That's not something
15 that the Army is going to pay for.
16 LOREN CARLSON: That's going to happen whether or
17 not we take it over now or whether we take it over later.
18 PETE CAPELL: Correct.
19 LOREN CARLSON: Whether we do early transfer or not,
20 that is all going to take place?
21 PETE CAPELL: Correct. The answer to your question
22 is, no, it won't cost you more. It would be the same.
23 KAREN KINGSTON: Go ahead.
24 CHUCK MASON: Chuck Mason. I personally think this
25 is a huge mistake to give it to the County. First off, I

00080

1 don't think they can ever be satisfied after we hear about
2 some of this ordnance. Secondly, you're suggesting the Feds
3 are going to give you a blank check to clean it up. That's
4 basically what you're saying. Thirdly, I think the property
5 should be just left alone, let Mother Nature turn it into a
6 wildlife refuge or whatever. In order to get some use out of
7 it, give it to somebody that can use it, i.e., what it's been
8 used for for the last hundred years.
9 Give it to the Washington National Guard. Give it
10 to the FBI. In my case, I'm representing veterans
11 organizations. I think it would be a super cemetery site for
12 veterans. They've been training out there for a hundred
13 years.
14 These three organizations don't care about all the
15 stuff that everybody's talking about. Personally, I think
16 it's going to cost -- the young man just ran away. I think
17 it's going to cost the taxpayers tons and tons and tons of
18 money by the time we get done.
19 First off, they want it perfectly clean. That turns
20 it into a landscape -- moonscape. Or we do nothing. Of
21 course, you can't do that. Give it to the Washington National
22 Guard and let them take care of it.
23 Personally, I think it's a mistake. Leave it alone.
24 Turn it into a wildlife refuge and give it to the FBI or the
25 Washington Guard.

00081

1 BUD VAN CLEVE: They don't want it.

2 CHUCK MASON: The other point. In the Reuse Plan,
3 the County said they were going to log it off.

4 JUDIE STANTON: No, it doesn't. It says there's
5 timber management. It recommended timber management, not
6 logging it off.

7 CHUCK MASON: I think the County is going to ruin it
8 and spend a ton of money at the same time.

9 JUDIE STANTON: We heard some of that during the
10 hearings as the decisions were being made about how it would
11 be reused.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Sean.

13 SEAN SHELDRAKE: This goes back to comments about
14 insurance, the cost estimate for early transfer. One of the
15 suggestions that Ecology and EPA have made to the County and
16 to the Army is to pick the higher end of available cost
17 estimates since public comment won't yet have been received on
18 the range of possible cleanup options. You know, it's
19 possible that the more expensive option will be selected.
20 There is a bit of uncertainty there in terms of, you
21 know, what's going to be found in the future, but also how the
22 public is going to receive perhaps a range of four options for
23 a certain area, back to what we talked about earlier,
24 geophysical investigation versus dig and sieve. Much
25 different cost.

00082

1 The regulators recommendation, it's been that the
2 higher end of those cost estimates be utilized since public
3 comment is going to be after that early transfer process is
4 concluded. I just wanted to make a note of that.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Don.

6 DON WASTLER: The property that Mr. Mason was
7 requesting was 300 acres, that's less than 10% of the property
8 for the veterans, for the people that actually gave this
9 country the freedom to have a park. I don't know if anyone's
10 considered that.

11 JUDIE STANTON: It was considered in the reuse
12 discussions.

13 DON WASTLER: I mean, even if the terrain is not
14 suitable, there's UXO there, these are the people that gave us
15 the freedom to even be here tonight. I think we should
16 consider at least something for them. Thank you. That's all
17 I want to say.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: One of the things, too, I
19 understand that the RAB is going to be dissolved at the
20 transfer, is that correct?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know the specifics.

22 JUDIE STANTON: The RAB is really advisory to the
23 Army during the cleanup process to get it to the point that
24 it's available for the reuse. It is our intention to have a
25 committee of some sort as we go through the process as well.

00083

1 KAREN KINGSTON: You second thought my question. I
2 think the intention of most of the people that have served on
3 here has been to bring up questions, bring up problems
4 possibly before they happen, to mitigate them in advance.
5 Otherwise, if we're supposed to come to the Commissioner
6 meetings and stand up and use our three minutes, it doesn't
7 seem like it would be very prudent.

8 JUDIE STANTON: We don't limit you to three minutes
9 either.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

11 How is everybody doing with questions? Do you have
12 something you want to say? I have a quick thing.

13 GREG JOHNSON: One thing quickly that goes along
14 with what Sean was saying, as far as Ecology and EPA leaning
15 more towards the conservative side. Not just for the reasons
16 he stated, but also because of the reasons for the
17 characterization, which has been brought up quite a few times
18 tonight, or lack thereof, characterizations, that's why we are
19 going to lean towards the more arduous cleanups that will be
20 selected.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

22 BUD VAN CLEVE: Time and place of next meeting?

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Well, I real quickly I wanted to
24 say that I personally did a checkup on your consultant that is
25 leading you through the transfer process, Mark O'Brien with --

00084

1 I'm trying to think of what his company is called, ERS.

2 BRONSON POTTER: Environmental Risk Services.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: There you go.

4 One of the things that had been said is that he's
5 responsible for the transfer of Mare Island, and that that was
6 pretty much what you were all basing his abilities on as far
7 as going through one of these transfers.

8 I just want to tell you, I checked with the
9 California State Lands Commission, and the Navy, and Weston
10 Solutions I believe is the name of their company, just to find
11 out about Mr. O'Brien because the RAB knew nothing, they
12 didn't know who in the heck that was, for a man that had been
13 supposedly so involved in something as magnanimous as a base
14 transfer.

15 I got unanimously, when I asked the direct question,
16 "Mark O'Brien, is he responsible for the Mare Island
17 transfer," came back, "Absolutely not."
18 Weston was 100% responsible for the Mare Island
19 transfer. Weston negotiated all of the required agreements
20 and provided all the required funding. This fact can be
21 confirmed, this person is telling me this fact can be
22 confirmed, which I did confirm that.

23 BILL BARRON: Can you give us that information, who
24 and where they're from?

25 KAREN KINGSTON: Weston.

00085

1 BRONSON POTTER: Who were you speaking to?

2 KAREN KINGSTON: This particular e-mail is from
3 Weston.

4 BILL BARRON: Who was it?

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Peter Cerebelli. The other one is
6 Patrick Kelly.

7 BILL BARRON: Both from Weston?

8 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

9 BILL BARRON: Who is the subcontractor, by the way,
10 for this project.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: I followed up a little bit on some
12 of these subcontractors. They're quite good. Boy, I'll tell
13 you, I'm real impressed with them. But I'm just reading off
14 of theirs because it was a little easier. The other ones were
15 quite long, so it was a little easier to say.

16 It also said that he was previously employed by the
17 Port of Oakland, which he was. Weston did use Mark O'Brien to
18 assist in negotiations with the port in connection with their
19 channel dredging problem only. The purpose of the engagement
20 was to secure a commitment from the port to deposit their
21 dredged material in the Mare Island dredge ponds that Weston
22 was developing and permitting as part of the early transfer.
23 The commitment was part of the justification package required
24 for Weston's investment in the dredge ponds only.
25 One of the things that it says here is, Furthermore,

00086

1 we have elected -- and this is from Peter Cerebelli. It says
2 that for one thing Weston does have the ability to do
3 negotiations, they have the ability to consult, all of that,
4 and I believe from something I read while I was at that UXO
5 conference, that Mark O'Brien had said they were not. They
6 are, by the way. I've checked that out.
7 From my standpoint, I'm just speaking personally,
8 from what I found out, they easily did this. And they are, as
9 said by the California State Lands Commission, it was Weston
10 that transferred Mare Island. They said, Furthermore, we,
11 meaning Weston, have elected to sever our relationship with
12 O'Brien on future projects.
13 I am hearing that from other contracting firms, have
14 also committed to saying that they would -- the Weston thing
15 that you're working on right now in Denver.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: But it's the same company.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes. But the Army is paying for
18 the third-party. You asked Matrix to sub to MSI and Weston to
19 sub to Matrix. Therefore, Weston has no direct contractual
20 relationship with O'Brien. Mark does participate in various
21 meetings with other parties in the role of Clark County's
22 representative only.
23 I wanted to pass this on to you because it concerned
24 me greatly with what I had heard about him at that huge
25 conference down in Monterey. At the time, some of the

00087

1 conversations I was involved in, they did not know that I had
2 any relationship with understanding -- that Mark O'Brien was
3 up here. I was quite all ears to hear what some of the other
4 contractors thought of O'Brien.
5 The fact that he only worked for Oakland and it had
6 to do with the dredge ponds makes me extremely concerned that
7 there will be something that is going to slip by you in this
8 escrow and this transfer that you won't have some base
9 covered, that somehow he's going to walk you into some sort of
10 loophole. I'm concerned with that.
11 I'm not saying that's what the gentleman is going to
12 do. I'm just saying that I have personally concerns. I
13 followed up on my concerns. I would just like to really
14 request that you also check, since he's the one leading you
15 through the transfer process. That's all I wanted to say.
16 JUDIE STANTON: Thank you.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: We are over our time, typical time.
18 Do we have any plans for the April meeting? I know we're
19 going to have an April meeting.
20 ERIC WAEHLING: We talked about having the
21 groundwater guy come out.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: We're going -- in fact, anybody
23 from the community, we're going to be talking about
24 groundwater and we're going to have a hydrologist here at the
25 next meeting.

00088

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. Assuming we're talking about
2 the 11th. Sorry, wrong month.
3 KAREN KINGSTON: You're the one that is with
4 Ecology?
5 BEN FORSON: Yes.
6 KAREN KINGSTON: Are you a hydrologist?
7 BEN FORSON: I'm an engineer. If you have a
8 hydrologist, I think I could --
9 KAREN KINGSTON: I'd sure like to have Ecology back
10 us up with having somebody that had some background in
11 hydrology while we listen, when we listen to Eric's boy or
12 girl, whatever.
13 Any other considerations?
14 ERIC WAEHLING: I want to confirm the RAB wants to
15 meet on April 9th, the second Wednesday of the month?
16 KAREN KINGSTON: Is it the 9th?
17 ERIC WAEHLING: According to my calendar. Is that
18 confirmed, that everybody wants to meet?
19 KAREN KINGSTON: We already have it scheduled here.
20 Do you have the schedule?
21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is it supposed to be the
22 third Wednesday?
23 ERIC WAEHLING: It's always the second Wednesday.
24 Did we change it to the third? We moved it this time because
25 we didn't have a space available.

00089

1 KAREN KINGSTON: What's the next Wednesday?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: The second Wednesday of the month,
3 which is the traditional time we've been doing it, is April
4 9th.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: After that is?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: The 16th.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Must be the 9th. We've got this
8 place April 9th. We can try and get the fire station back,
9 but right now we do have this meeting room. We won't put the
10 tables quite like this next time because this is difficult in
11 the regular RAB meetings.

12 BUD VAN CLEVE: I say keep it here.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Everybody else? All right? So
14 April 9th back here, and we'll be getting into hydrology.

15 DON WASTLER: One last thing I have to say. If I'm
16 not mistaken, Karen said there's four seats left open on the
17 Restoration Advisory Board. If you like, you're welcome to
18 apply, make an application.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: We have applications tonight.

20 DON WASTLER: That's what this new thing we formed
21 is for, to review the applications. We need all the people we
22 can get with us. If you're interested or know somebody in
23 your neighborhood that's interested, that wants in on all the
24 details of what's going on, this is an opportunity.

25 BARBARA CORIGLIANO: I kind of just got this in the

00090

1 last week.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Just think about it.

3 DON WASTLER: Karen has the applications if you want
4 to fill one out.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: We'll try to answer everyone's
6 question, whether they're a member or not. The documents are
7 available. To be honest, being a member or not being a member
8 is somewhat academic. We're going to do our best to answer
9 any questions anybody has.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Is there a motion to adjourn?

11 VALERIE LANE: I'll make a motion we adjourn.

12 COLEEN BROAD: Aye.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Aye.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: See you on April 9th.

15 (Meeting adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00091

1

CERTIFICATE

2

3

STATE OF WASHINGTON)

) ss.

4

County of Clark)

5

6

I, Jaime S. Morrocco, a Notary Public for Washington, certify that the Camp Bonneville Restoration Advisory Board Meeting here occurred at the time and place set forth in the caption hereof; that at said time and place I reported in Stenotype all proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting under my direction; and the foregoing transcript, pages 2 to 90 both inclusive, contains a full, true and correct record of all such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

10

11

I further advise you that as a matter of firm policy, the Stenographic notes of this transcript will be destroyed two years from the date appearing on this Certificate unless notice is received otherwise from any party or counsel hereto on or before said date; Witness my hand and notarial seal at Vancouver, Washington, this 24th day of March 2003.

12

13

14

15

16

17

Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM
Notary Public for Washington

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25